

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Examiner's Office Action dated March 20, 2006. Applicants have amended the claims and added new claims to both clarify the features of the invention and more completely recite those features which were disclosed within the specification. All features within the present claims are fully supported within the specification as evidenced by the description on pages 8-12 and illustrated by Figure 3. No new matter has been added, and the amendment places the claims in better condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments to the claims. The discussion/arguments provided below reference the claims in their amended form.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

At paragraph 3 of the present Office Action, Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-12 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Alam, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,336,124) in view of *Hohensee, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,813,020), *Vanderwiele, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,767,833) and *Orton, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,590,674).

Applicants would first note that of the references relied upon, at least one reference, namely *Orton* is not a valid prior art reference since Applicants' date of invention predates *Orton's* filing date. However, even considering this reference, Applicants' amendments and new claims overcome the above 103 rejections in so much as Applicants' claims now present additional features and clarification of previous features that establishes the clear novelty of Applicants' invention. Among these features are: (1) the storage of multiple device-dependent copies of a complex component/unit to support the multiple presentation devices to which the document may be outputted to and (2) the storage of complex components/units in both device independent format (for general use) as well as device-dependent format. Several additional features of Applicants' claims are not suggested by the above combination of references, and the presentation herein of two specific features is not intended to be an exhaustive recitation of the various allowable claim features. None of these features are taught or suggested by any of the combinations of the above references.

BO9-99-013

Amendment H

09/461,521

- 10 -

Given the above reasons, it is clear that the combination of references does not suggest key features of Applicants' invention, and one skilled in the art would not find Applicants' invention unpatentable over the combination. The above claims are therefore allowable over the combination.

BO9-99-013

Amendment H

09/461,521


- 11 -

CONCLUSION

Applicants have diligently responded to the Office Action by amending the claims to more accurately and completely recite the features of the invention, as described within the specification. Applicants further provide arguments that conclusively rebut the 103(a) rejections of the claims. Since the amendments and arguments overcome the §103 rejections, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all claims now pending.

Applicants further respectfully request the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney of record at 512.343.6116 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Eustace P. Isidore
Reg. No. 56,104
Dillon & Yudell LLP
8911 North Capital of Texas Highway
Suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
512.343.6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)